



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,548	03/26/2001	Saqib Jang	MGC 302	3375
23581	7590	04/22/2005	EXAMINER	
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C. 520 S.W. YAMHILL STREET SUITE 200 PORTLAND, OR 97204			SAM, PHIRIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2661	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,548

Applicant(s)

JANG ET AL.

Examiner

Phirin Sam

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 49 and 51-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49, 51-53 and 56-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 54, 55 and 61 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 52101.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice: claim 50 depends on claim 48 which belongs to group II. The examiner will not examine this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,999,966 hereinafter referred as "McDougall" in view of US Patent 6,078,810 hereinafter referred as "Olds".

McDougall discloses the invention (**claims 49 and 51**) as claimed including a system for use in videoconferencing (see Fig. 1, element 10, wherein it discloses the video conferencing system), the system comprising:

- (a) a service provider network configured to enable users of multiple enterprise subscriber networks to transfer data via a global computer network, the service provider network having an access point (see Figs. 1-2, col. 8, lines 15-38);
- (b) a videoconferencing services switch located on the access point of the service provider network, the videoconferencing process videoconferencing calls services switch being configured to from terminals on each of the multiple subscriber networks (see Figs. 1-2, element 14, col. 6, lines 59-65, and col. 7, lines 10-25).

McDougall doesn't disclose the subscriber specific setting. However, Olds discloses these limitations (see col. 3, lines 27-31). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the subscriber specific setting teaching by Olds with McDougall. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the security conference read on column 3, lines 28-30. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Olds and McDougall to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 49 and 51.

4. Claims 52, 53, and 56-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,999,966 hereinafter referred as "McDougall" in view of US Patent 6,078,810 hereinafter referred as "Olds" as applied to claims above, and further in view of US Patent 6,188,687 hereinafter referred as "Mussman".

Regarding claims 52, 53, and 56-60, McDougall doesn't disclose a video gateway. However, Mussman discloses the video gateway (see Fig. 1, element 16, col. 3, lines 42-47). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the video gateway teaching by Mussman with Olds and McDougall. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to intercept and steer data to other network. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2661

would have been obvious to combine Mussman and McDougall to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 52, 53, and 56-60.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-17 are allowed.

6. Claims 54, 55, and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(1) Lecourtier et al (U.S. Patent 6,373,85)

(2) Bruno et al (U.S. Patent 6,262,978)

(3) Hardy (U.S. Patent 6,025,870)

(4) Browning et al (U.S. Patent 5,903,302)

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phirin Sam whose telephone number is (571) 272-3082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272 - 3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Phirin Sam', written over a horizontal line.

**PHIRIN SAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER**